DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 667 UD 018 918

AUTHOR Duane, Edward A.; Bridgeland, William M.
TITLE Power Analysis in Comparative Educational Politics.
PUB DATE 4 Apr 77
NOTE 26p.; Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, New York, April 4, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; *Educational Policy; Educational Research; *Models; Policy Formation; *Politics; *Power Structure; *Social Science Research; Theories

ABSTRACT

The relative newness of educational politics as a research field means that, aside from possibly systems analysis, much theory-building has yet to be done. In this regard, power analysis has both limitations and potentialities. Some people contend that power is evident only in those situations involving government agencies utilizing negative sanctions. At the other extreme, power has been used to include all forms of social influence. In fact, power analysis can provide a frame of reference at once unifying and integrative, but sufficiently discriminating to account for a wide range of behavior in comparative educational policy making. Researchers now generally support the Weberian notion that power is a form of interpersonal relationship. Power analysis offers a frequently overlooked potential for systematically probing many areas of educational behavior in general and comparative educational politics in particular. It has the added advantage of permitting the researcher to move deductively from macroscopic configurations such as "monolithic" interest group structures down to relatively microscopic phenomena like co-optation as a specific tactic. (Author/WI)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

NOV 20 1978

UD018918E

ED164667

# POWER ANALYSIS IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATIONAL POLITICS

Edward A. Duane
Associate Professor
Department of Social Science
Michigan State University

and

William M. Bridgeland
Assistant Professor
Department of Social Science
Michigan State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William M. Bridgeland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UD018 918

# POWER ANALYSIS IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

## I. Introduction

This paper explores the potentialities of a power approach to the study of comparative educational politics. It fits within the topic: "modes of analysis." As such there is no attempt to do an in-depth study on any nation nor to make systematic comparisons between any set of nations. Furthermore, this does not aim at providing a "handbook" or "how to" strategy for doing "nuts and bolts" research in cross-cultural settings. Given the newness of the whole sub-field of comparative educational politics, we have chosen instead to identify certain basic variables and general methodological issues. The first part of the paper describes the essentials of power theory. The remainder involves an application of these concepts to some basic research dimensions of comparative educational politics.

The relative newness of educational politics as a research field means that, aside from possibly systems analysis, much theory-building has yet to be done. In this regard, power analysis has both limitations and potentialities. No single concept in socio-political analysis is more overburdened with often disparate conventional and academic meanings. At one extreme, some people contend that power is evident only in those situations involving governmental agencies utilizing negative sanctions as in the case of "power politics" among nations. At the other extreme, power has been used to include all forms of social influence. This latter usage undercuts its utility as an analytical tool. In contrast with the preceding notions, this paper attempts to demonstrate that power analysis

can provide a frame of reference at once unifying and integrative and yet sufficiently discriminating which can account for a wide range of behavior in comparative educational policy-making. In fact, it is our basic contention that the power construct, in contrast to the systems concept approaches the dynamic interplay of important actors: focusing on where inputs take place; decisions are made; and outputs occur, which become components of new policy inputs.

## II. Power Analysis: the Model

This part of the paper is composed of: 1) a definition of power as a probablistic impact or control relationship; 2) the development of a typology; 3) the identification of four basic dimensions or qualities common to all types of power; and 4) an exploration of the "base," or power resources which culminates in typology of general capabilities and specific tactics.

1) Definition of Power: Researchers now generally support the Weberian notion that power is a form of interpersonal relationship. It involves minimally the attempt to use one's capabilities to achieve an impact upon another as well as the actions and reactions of that other.[1] To modify a phrase from communications theory, it is: "who (intentionally) does what to whom with what effect."[2]

A power relationship is a process of dynamic assessment between an initiating party (a controller) and a target party (a controllee) which can be expressed by the following:[3]

$$\left\{ \text{of A's power} = \right.$$

$$\left[ \text{(A's estimation of his own capacity x intent) - (A's estimation of the target's capacity x intent)} \right] -$$

$$\left[ \text{(B's estimation of his own capacity x intent) - (B's estimation of the iniator's capacity x intent)} \right]$$

At a minimum then, successful impact would include a perception on the part of the controllee that the controller has both the resources and the motivation to move him. Thus the existence of a political resource (a union) by a group (teachers) in itself may not tell us much about the real distribution of power. One must go beyond this attempt and tap the perceptions of those who would use it as well as those on whom it would be used (the school administrators) to determine how each assesses himself and others with respect to both capacity and will.

The concept of power as a dynamic, interpersonal relationship can take on added empirical meaning in the economic analogy of supply and demand. Emerson argues that the power of one person is inversely related to his dependence upon another; if you need something another can supply, he, the supplier, has potential influence over you.[4] Whether or not his capabilities can be translated into control depends on two variables; A) the relative intensity of your need, and B) the relative availability of alternative suppliers. For example, American teachers generally were in a potentially strong position from the 1950's until the mid-1960's because of high demand for them (e.g., the "baby boom," high economic growth, etc.) which significantly exceeded the supply (the pool of available teachers).

Since that time, demand (with a declining birth rate, slowed economic growth, etc.) has contracted while the supply of teachers has continued to grow and their basic power standing has thereby been eroded. The British appear to have experienced a similar pattern. Briefly power can thus be understood as a social exchange entailing a dynamic mutual assessment related to conditions of demand and supply.

2) Types of Power: As with most significant human behavior, power is not a unitary phenomena but rather takes on a variety of forms. A number of theorists have differentiated several types of control behavior: authority, influence, sanction, force, and manipulation.[5] Authority, as imperative obedience (or moral standing) involves the controller assuming the right to command the controllee, and, in turn, the controllee willing to comply with the controller's expectations which he perceives as "right and reasonable" and about which he feels guilt if he does not acquiesce. Authority, then is legitimacy. Influence is understood here as an impact achieved typically by persuasion (or, following Bell, it results from the mediation of information and consequences of actions).[6] Sanction (often called "power") refers to control resulting from the implicit or explicit promise of reward and/or threat of punishments. Force as the actual impression of punishments needs little further elaboration. Manipulation is a hidden or covert form of control. With manipulation, the target party is unaware that what he is doing has been secretly prompted ("hidden persuasion") by the initiating party. Where influence necessitates a significant commonality of values as the basis of effective persuasion, manipulation reflects situations of value conflict forcing the initiator to use a covert approach.

Turning directly to comparative educational politics, one can see the research potential in distinguishing between the major variants of control behavior employing a simple ideal-type distinction.[7]

| Consensus Educational Politics | Conflict Educational Politics |
|---|---|
| 1. authority | 1. sanction |
| 2. influence | 2. force |
| | 3. manipulation |

Consensus politics refers to what appears to have been an important pattern in many nations where education has had a significant degree of political autonomy from other institutions (England and the United States) and/or it evidences a high level of agreement on educational goals and a clearly hierarchical arrangement among educators (France). The latter qualities of goal consensus and organizational integration might apply to a number of African, Asian and Latin American educational systems which have modeled themselves on European prototypes. Under the consensus pattern, authority is a pronounced type of power: teachers; laymen and governmental officials tend to defer to those who claim superior educational training and insight - the school administrators. Supplementing authoritative action is influence in the form of persuasion and the mediation of certain rewards. For example, when administrators exhort teachers with such a phrase as "we're all in this together." Other forms of control behavior would be expected to occur with much less frequency. Moving to what might become an increasingly likely cross-cultural educational politics pattern: open cleavages within and mounting pressures from without the school system, authority and influence would be expected to recede and strong negative sanctions,

i.e., teacher strikes and firings, become more pronounced. There is also a reasonable likelihood that mass movements will arise similar to the American antibusing phenomena where ambitious politicians could be tempted into the covert triggering of public reactions through manipulation (for example, of code words). There is also an increasing possibility of coercion (that is force) in the form of civil disobedience, student violence and reactive police violence.

3) Dimensions of Power: Whatever the type of power being observed, from authority to force, a basic question remains as to the dimensions or qualities of power. Lasswell and Kaplan have identified four components of power: scope, weight, domain and base.[8]

It is not enough to say that A has impact upon B. We are interested in knowing the "what" (scope) of this power, or what is the range of values or behaviors affected, i.e., job tenure, salaries and/or curriculum, etc.? Given a certain scope of power one is anxious to find out about "how much" (weight) of power or the degree of impact A has over B in the respective issue or behavioral area? Furthermore, one is concerned to ask about the "who" (domain) of this power or what is the quantity and quality of the people affected by A? To complete this picture one should analyze the "how" (base) or what are the ways by which A achieved his control over B's behavior, i.e., rewards, punishments, better information, and/or superior professional status, etc.?

Turning directly to comparative educational politics, the analytical utility of distinguishing between these dimensions becomes apparent by again making the comparison between the conflict and consensus modes. Under the consensus pattern, the structure of power tends to be monolithic.

In America, for instance, the major educational groups were once closely woven into a broad coalition under the overall aegis of the major school district superintendents. Schoolmen and their allies tended to form a united fromt on many educational issues: financial; personnel and curricular. Thus it would have been no surprise to find that a school administrator had a strong impact (heavy weight) in many areas of his subordinate's professional lives (wide scope) and that he had achieved this by mobilizing a wide range of capabilities or a broad base (superior information, authority, and the mediation of basic occupational rewards and deprivations). This picture might be most applicable to rural, small town or suburban areas of industrial societies and perhaps as well to the more industrialized of the southern hemisphere societies.

As rapid social change moves a society into a post-industrial phase, education like other power systems would be expected to undergo increasing organizational differentiation; a clear-cut chain of command and rank and file submissiveness would presumably give way to a pattern of multi-group competition. This emerging power structure in education might be expected to consist of a collection of specialized power groups, undergoing continuing reorganization and change even as they form all manner of temporary alliances of conveniences for and against each other.

If the preceding situation does take shape, one might well anticipate that the modal power profile of an educational group would involve a narrow scope (its impact largely confined to its specialized area of interest, a medium to light weight (it faces competition from alternative groups in its area of speciality) and a narrow base (highly sophisticated and specialized power resources that are not readily transferable into

impact in other areas).

Empirical examples of differentiated educational power organizations are more complex and varied than the preceding ideal-type. The Bridgeland and Duane study of the state educational power structure in Michigan indicates the existence of two basic types of educational interest groups; and these have been labeled:"special focus" and "general focus." The special focus can be differentiated into a functional variant, i.e. special educationalists and adult educationalists, etc., and a geographic variant, i.e., metropolitan and intermediate school district lobbyists. This first type in its functional form, which is increasing in quantity and effectiveness, has a narrow scope (its impact is largely confined to its specialized area of interest), a comparatively heavy weight (it largely monopolizes its sphere of influence), a relatively small domain (only a segment of the total school age population), and a narrow base (highly sophisticated power resources that are non-transferable).

On the surface, the general focus type groups, represented by many of the contemporary teacher unions like the Michigan Education Association, appear to have a contempoary power position; they seem to have more political clout than they may have actually have. A typical union has a wide scope (in trying to represent the full spectrum of interests of its diverse teacher constituents, it must address nearly every educational policy issue), and not infrequently it has a surprisingly light to medium weight (despite its large membership, sizable treasury and sophisticated staff. First, it must often simultaneously scatter its resources thinly over many policy areas. Second, it frequently faces competition from rival unions and confronts various specialized educational interests.

The latter have distinct advantages in that they may mass resources in a way that unions cannot because of union's concurrent policy commitments. Third, teacher unions are also characterized by a strong "bottom up" flow of power wherein there is a continuous and taxing necessity of building coalitions among significantly autonomous locals in order to reach many important policy decisions within the organization.

As indicated by the preceding American examples, using the dimensions of power in a cross-cultural analysis is likely to yield some discriminating insights into the organization of educational power.

4) Power Capabilities: The base of power itself deserves and has previously received considerable elaboration. Kaplan has identified five fundamental types of resources or capabilities that any one party could use in trying to gain control over another party.[9] Two of the bases are obvious: reward (B's perception that A can mediate benefits for him, i.e. income, occupation and knowledge, etc.) and punishment (B's perception that A can impose deprivations upon him, i.e., loss of life, social rejection and occupational blockage, etc.). Legitimacy or moral acquiescence is another base of power B's perception that A has the right and perhaps the duty to prescribe and proscribe behavior for him and that B has the duty to comply even when it is contrary to his immediate self-interest to do wo. Often closely linked to, but distinct from the preceding is reference (B's emotional disposition to respond to A). Finally, a power resource usually subsumed under authority, but which deserves separate treatment given its role in industrializing societies is expertise or the possession of specialized knowledge (B perceived that A has information and/or analytical skills that B, needs and yet does not possess). In contemporary

advanced industrial educational systems, authority is probably best defined in terms of expertise.

In comparative educational politics it seems useful to extend the earlier comparison between the consensus and conflict models to some of these ideas about capabilities:

| Consensus Educational Politics | Conflict Educational Politics |
|---|---|
| 1. legitimacy | 1. reward |
| 2. reference | 2. punishment |
| 3. expertise | 3. expertise |

One common characteristic of these two patterns is that they are both based on modern bureaucratic organization, and as such, specialization or expertise is a focal resource.

Because the consensus pattern rests heavily on commonality of means and ends, this should be reflected in the high legitimacy of the administrator who is in the position to turn these shared values into a major power resource. Moreover, given the high normative agreement, there is great potential for positively affective response by teachers to the administrators as (reference). Administrators might be able to mobilize these sentiments either as emotional interdependence (displays of caring and respect), dependence (playing upon desires for control from above) and/or ethnocentrism (heightening common hostilities to potential out-groups).

Under the conflict pattern, moral and emotional capabilities can diminish and thereby necessitate build-up in the capacity to reward (salary step scales and fringe benefits, etc.) and to punish (lay-offs, job elimination and strikes, etc.). Bargaining becomes the typical mode of decision-making. Such bargaining concerns a decision where the preferred

outcome is different for differing participants (conflict). Yet these parties have enough differences in the intensity of their desire regarding the outcome to permit negotiation.[10]

The preceding broad capabilities can be further refined into several techniques. Using the work of Corwin and Froman and our own modifications and additions, we have identified and defined (see Table I) a range of power tactics that appear to be particularly germane to educational politics: passive adaption, coalition, cooptation, bargaining, and assertion. From there we have combined the broad capabilities and specific tactics into a typology using the previous consensus and conflict perspectives (see Table II). The only new element in the table is the distinction between "internal" and "external" political settings or the politics among educators as contrasted from the politics between educators and non-educators. For example, in Cell D (specific tactic/external setting under the consensus pattern), passive adaption would be exemplified by a traditional reaction of many American school administrators to do nothing that might in any way arouse the ire of any vocal element in the community; cooptation refers to the control pattern that many school administrators have had over their formal superiors: school boards. By contrast, in the Cell I (specific tactic/external setting under the conflict pattern). Coalition could take the form of school administrators as management allying themselves with the business community against teacher unions. Assertion refers to an apparent an increasing American administrative pattern to proactively attempt to control their external environment by sophisticated public relations research and techniques.

In conclusion, power analysis facilitates the identification of

of various basic types of impact behavior and calls attention to the fact that each type is a composite of several basic dimensions. Moreover, one dimension (the base) can be broken down into broad capabilities and specific tactics that have an immediate utility in making inferences in comparative educational politics.

## III. Power Analysis in Comparative Educational Politics

This section of the paper involves a more direct application of the power approach to several basic research dimensions of comparative educational politics. To begin with, power analysis appears to be most useful in mapping out the paths of governmental, non-governmental interest group and mass citizen impacts upon the educational process. In turn, delimiting the patterns of power initiative and response of educational interest groups in their attempts to gain, maintain or regain control over educational policy formulation and implementation is highlighted.

Underlying these preceding statements is a range of educational research questions:

1. the geographic dimension: what is the nature of the relative power between the different geographic levels of the educational governance structure in a given society? Do smaller governmentally centralized and socially homogeneous societies like Britain and Sweden more readily move to centralized educational decisionmaking? Alternatively, do nations like the United States and Canada where relative social heterogeneity, local control traditions and/or federalism perpetuate competition among the several layers of administration (for example, local, intermediate, state and federal)? What about many African and Asian countries where governmental planners aiming at maximizing scarce resources through

centralized policymaking confront deep political and cultural cleavages along tribal, ethnic, religious, and/or class-caste lines? What are the structural patterns for accommodating the resulting conflicts between these forces?

2. the functional level: to what extent in each society has educational power become bureaucratically hierarchical with generalist superordinates controlling specialist subordinates? On the other hand, competition among educational specialists, each organized to forward its segmental interest and thereby effectively challenging attempts at vertical integration? Western European countries appear to be closer to the vertical control mode while American education has become increasingly characterized by fragmented and horizontal tendencies.

3. the group dimension: who are the major participants in the educational process (governmental, interest group and citizen)? What policymaking resources are available to them? How do they seek to influence the educational policymaking process? What type(s) of power do they exercise (authority, influence and/or sanction, etc.)? What are the issue areas? What is the degree of impact? What groups or segments of society are affected by this power? What are the significant relationships (coalitions and cleavages) among the participants in the formulation of educational policy in each society?

Relative to this latter factor (group dimension) the analysis of educational groups has a rich comparative research potential. There are a number of recent American studies in this area whose findings can be transferred as null hypotheses to other societies, for example, Bailey et al. (1961), Master et al. (1963), Iannacone (1967), Usdan et al.

(1969), Milstein-Jennings (1973) and Campbell et al. (1974).

It seems fitting to begin by citing a classical statement on interest groups in a comparative political perspective: Almond and Coleman (1960).[11] They developed the following typology of political interest groups: anomic; non-associational; institutional and associational. Anomic groups are represented by spontaneous unstructured breakthroughs into the process as, for example, university students engaging in episodic riots and demonstrations. Non-associational interest groups include the informal and intermittent representations of tribal, ethnic, status and regional groups. The two preceding types would be particularly useful in analyzing educational politics in the third world nation-states with their plural cultures, student activism and explosive social environments. Institutional interest groups are organizations which perform other formal social functions, but which also informally forward their own collective interests. For example, when a national educational ministry performs its legal functions of educational policymaking, implementation and regulation, but also is vigorously defending and expanding its institutional self-interests in conjunction with or in opposition to other government agencies, private interest groups or the citizenry, then it constitutes an institutional interest group. Thus in both developing nations with their penchant for central planning and in governmentally regulated advanced industrial societies, interest articulation by institutional educational interest groups bears close attention. The associational type is the form usually studied. The organizations have full-time specialists, standardized organizational procedures, articulated objectives, and developed channels for presenting of demands. In the United States

and Canada the more obvious examples are teacher unions, administrator and/or school board associations. The Almond-Coleman approach alerts us to interest articulation in educational policy-making not only in the form of associational groups, but also in the actions and reactions of anomic, non-associational and institutional type interest groups.

More potential for comparative research seems possible from an analysis of the overall relationships between these groups. A major theoretical contribution in this area is the Iannaccone typology (1967) of educational interest group power structures: disparate, monolithic, fragmented, and syndical.[12] The disparate (locally-based) one refers to a pattern where educators with basically parochial political orientations, approach governments individually (i.e., non-associational) and thus do not form coalitions among themselves. The disparate model might well be applicable to some of the developing nations. The monolithic (province-or nationwide) pattern is, on the other hand, where organized educational groups work in concert in the educational policy process at provincial and national levels. One might expect to find the monolithic-consensus configuration in many industrialized societies. With even further differentiation of interests among educational interest groups a fragmented-conflict pattern might emerge. In this latter situation educational power groups no longer form a "united front," but are sharply competitive in seeking their separate interests. Recent studies indicate that this has become the American trend. In the case of certain post-industrial, Scandanavian type social welfare societies, the syndical pattern might be present. This is where educational groups have been able to aggregate separate interests sufficiently to be linked together in a

government sponsored unit along with executive and legislative personnel in the determination of educational policy.

4. the systemic dimension: when looking at the broad patterns of educational power in a given society, a central issue is that of the stratification of power in the educational policymaking process. There is, of course, a well-developed literature on the structure of power among political elites. It provides conceptual and methodological tools for attempting to answer the basic questions: what are the features of the power structures in education in a given society? And how are these structures to be studied?

Looking first at the conceptual perspectives from this research, there is, of course, the "old elitist" model (by the Lynds) of a single pyramid of power at whose apex a close-knit power group is said to monopolize all political decisions and impose a tight control on the followers. Such an image may still be relevant to local and even national educational levels in some African, Asian and Latin American societies.

However, when turning to industrial societies, one might expect that two alternative models: neo-elitist and pluralist would provide better interpretations.[13] Both of them share the assumption that power, emanating from immense, bureaucratized organizations, tends to have a relatively narrow scope (specialization of objectives), comparatively light weight (competition), usually a wide domain (masses on a rather narrow base (specialized skills). From that point on there is a basic divergence in the interpretation of power structures. The neo-elitists tend to see industrial countries as emergent mass societies and, as such, power is concentrated among a few, increasingly interlocking elite groups who

dominate the "big decision" in a setting of mass apathy. By contrast, the pluralists generally perceive power in the shape of a plurality of well-organized interests and each of these is supposed to be able to defend its sphere of influence and this results in a balance of power which prevents the hegemony of one or a few over the other power centers. To what extent might these divergent approaches shed light on comparative educational power in advanced industrial societies? There is an initial impression that in those industrial nations similar to the United States, which have experienced the recent growth of militant teacher unionism, the pluralistic-competitive configuration would be most applicable? By contrast, those nations which may be moving into a post-militant stage of unionism (something like the "iron law of oligarchy") form of elite convergence might have greater explanatory validity?

5. the methodology dimension: again from power elite research, there are three broad approaches that have characterized the investigation of structures of power:[14] 1) the positional approach, 2) reputational approach and 3) the decisional approach. The positional method involves the compilation of lists of incumbents of formal offices or positions as indices of power distribution; the individuals with the greatest number and/or highest offices are assumed to be pivotol power persons in a given policy area. It has been criticized for its static conception of power. When applied to cross-cultural research, there is the added issue of different terminology covering different positions and/or the same positions in different societies having different power potentialities. And yet, at least, in the exploratory stages of research, it has the asset of operational ease. The reputational method, variations aside, involves asking

informants ("experts") to identify and rank powerful persons and groups. It has been criticized for not measuring the actual path of power, but merely the reputation for power and for not adequately differentiating the dimensions of power (scope and weight, etc.). Furthermore, in so far as it involves interviewing, the findings can suffer from potentially major cross-cultural communications barriers between the investigator and the respondent. And yet it presents the possibility of measuring general power direction being adaptable to a qualitative or elite interviewing mode which would seem to have special utility in a cross-cultural setting. Finally, the decisional approach attempts to delimit the concrete actions of those involved in specific policy decisions and thereby to, hopefully, come closer to the actual power process. Typically, this is achieved through in-depth interviews, attendance at meetings, and analyzing reports, speeches and mass media accounts. In doing comparative educational power research, the goal of either direct, close observation and/or actual participatior in the process may present fundamental logistical difficulties. Furthermore, this method best fits case studies whose limited generalizability reduces the utility of the approach for cross-cultural comparisons in educational politics.

Briefly, where feasible, a power research strategy that would judiciously combine all of these methods should yield findings with high validity. This is not merely a pious hope. In this regard, comparative educational politics researchers might do well to look closely at the design of such studies as,for example,a recent five year, four nation (India, Poland, Yugoslavia and the United States) comparison of the values of local community leaders.[15] In the study problems of cross-cultural

communications were reduced because it was "an international cooperative in which design, execution and analysis of the studies were jointly planned and conducted by teams of researchers from four countries under the sponsorship of the International Social Science Council." (p. 253) Furthermore it had the advantage of a multi-dimensional research design wherein four major lines of inquiry took place:

1. compilation of vast amounts of aggregate data (social and political
2. systematic content analysis of leader's speeches and other public pronouncements
3. intensive interviews (involving four pre-tests) with 3,929 political leaders
4. the development of 27 case studies in political decisionmaking.

There are numerous similar efforts especially designed and executed by agricultural economists and rural sociologists particularly on community leadership. Such extraordinary studies can rarely be replicated, but they do contain much insight into methodological opportunities and limits that could guide the researcher in comparative educational politics.

## IV. Conclusion

It has been the objective of this paper to indicate "the power of power." It shows that power analysis offers a frequently overlooked potential for systematically probing many areas of educational behavior in general and comparative educational politics in particular. In fact, it is our basic contention that the power construct not only complements systems concept, but approaches the dynamic interplay of actors where inputs take place, decisions are reached and outputs become components of new policy inputs. The power approach has the added advantage of permitting the researcher to move deductively from macroscopic configurations such as "monolithic" interest group structures down to relatively micro-

scopic phenomena like cooptation as a specific tactic. We then can go back up, inductively, from the particular to the systemic level in comparative educational behavior as in the "elite convergence" theory.

The power approach avoids both raw empircism (simple counting) and arid grand theorizing (abstruse conceptualizing) in favor of analysis at the middle range of conceptualization. Meaningful comparative categories are targeted, relationships are isolated and the educational decision-making process can be understood. It is a model which should substantially further our understanding in this as yet relatively unexamined area of comparative human behavior.

TABLE I: DEFINITIONS OF POLITICAL TACTICS

[Adapted from Corwin (1965)
and Froman (1962)]

1. passive adaptation: a more or less self-imposed political withdrawal by the schools in order to avoid possible displeasure of or backlash from the power world outside of education. It represents a variation of Friedrich's law of anticipated reactions: "do nothing that might be questioned by a vocal number of the public."

2. coalition: an overt alliance or "united front" between the schools and other organizations for particular shared goals.

3. cooptation: not only differs in its outward appearance, but also in its objective from coalition. While coalition seeks to build cooperation to attain a shared goal, cooptation aims at a take-over of an organization by another with which it had conflicting goals. In short, an organization would attempt to control its opponents by integrating them into its own leadership ("if you can't beat 'em, absorb 'em").

4. bargaining: a relationship between groups that have divergent interests, in this respect similar to cooptation. In cooptation there is an effort to cover over the attempted control of opposing groups, in bargaining there is a moe clear recognition of differences and the need for accommodating interests on both sides. One general form, explicit bargaining, involves an immediate and overt exchange of benefits-a quid pro quo-between the participants. Another type, implicit bargaining, entails creating a non-specific or generalized indebtedness between different participants.

5. competition: a relationship which like bargaining involves a clash of values between the parties. And yet it is one which implies a deeper conflict which is less likely to be open to resolution by bargaining and more likely to lead to deadlock and thereby to necessitating third party intervention.

6. assertion: in contrast with passive adaption, the schools here initiate unilateral political action or move into a "forward strategy" to promote their interests. Typically, it would entail efforts to increase the political capital of schools by image-building and other forms of political communication.

TABLE II: A TYPOLOGY OF POWER CAPABILITIES AND TACTICS

| | GENERAL POWER PATTERN: CONSENSUS POLITICS | |
|---|---|---|
| | Internal | External |
| General Capability | A<br>legitimacy, reference (positive), expertise | B<br>legitimacy, reference, expertise (general) |
| Specific Tactic | C<br>persuasion, bargaining (implicit) rewards (offered and/or delivered) | D<br>passive adaption, coalition, cooptation, bargaining |

| | GENERAL POWER PATTERN: CONFLICT POLITICS | |
|---|---|---|
| | Internal | External |
| General Capability | F<br>expertise (specialized), reference (negative), reward and punishment | G<br>reference (negative), reward, punishment and expertise |
| Specific Tactic | H<br>bargaining (explicit) and coalition | I<br>bargaining (explicit), coalition, competition and assertion or "forward strategy" |

FOOTNOTES

1. Marvin E. Olsen (ed.): Power in Societies (1970)

2. C. Hovland: "Communication and Persuasion," W.W. Charters and N.L. Gage (eds.): Relationships in the Psychology of Education (1963), p. 239.

3. Our synthesis of the credibility concept (K.J. Holsti: International Politics (1963) p. 239 and Mr. Dale Mann's suggestion about power as a net relationship.

4. R.M. Emerson: "Power-Dependence Relations," ASR, 27 (1962), pp. 31-40.

5. H.K. Lasswell and A.A. Kaplan: Power and Society (1950), R.A. Dahl: "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, 2(1957), pp. 201-215; P. Bachrach and M.S. Baratz: Power and Poverty (1972).

6. L. Iannaccone: "State Politics of Education" in M.W. Kirst (ed.): The Politics of Education at the Local, State and Federal Levels (1970), pp. 284-299; B. Dean Bowles "The Power Structures in State Educational Politics," Phi Delta Kappa, 49(1968), pp. 337-340 and M.D. Usdan: et al.: Education and State Politics (1969).

7. Lasswell and Kaplan; Ibid., pp. 76-79.

8. Abraham A. Kaplan: "Power in Perspective" in R.J. Kahn and E. Boulding: Power and Conflict in Organizations (1964) pp. 15-17.

9. L.A. Froman: People and Politics (1963), p. 32.

10. Froman, Ibid.

11. G.A. Almond and J.S. Coleman: The Politics of the Developing Areas (1960), pp. 33-35.

12. Iannaccone, Ibid.

13. A neo-elitist analysis: C. Wright Mills: The Power Elite (1956) and a pluralist analysis: R.A. Dahl: Who Governs (1961).

14. C.M. Bonjean et al.(eds.): Community Politics (1971) pp. 164-167.

15. P.E. Jacob: "Leader's Values and the Dynamics of Community Integration: A Four Nation Comparative Study," in Bonjean et al., Ibid., pp. 250-262.